

REMARKS

A total of 23 claims remain in the present application. The foregoing amendments are presented in response to the Office Action mailed January 18, 2007 wherefore reconsideration of this application is requested. By way of the above-noted amendments, claims 6, 15, and 24 have been amended to more clearly define features of the present invention, and in particular to emphasize the features that respective CDCs are calculated for each record, and that the method of the present invention is performed entirely within the token, rather than using resources of a handset, for example. In preparing the foregoing claim amendments, careful attention was paid to ensure that no new subject matter has been introduced.

Referring now to the text of the Office Action:

- claims 2-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement; and
- claims 2-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teaching of United States Patent No. 6,968,209 (Ahlgren et al.) in view of United States Patent No. 6,879,989 (Dietrich et al.).

The Examiner's claim rejections are believed to be traversed in view of the above-noted claim amendments, and further in view of following discussion.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The claims have been amended to ensure that the language of the claims is explicitly supported by the text of the originally filed specification. In particular, phrase "respective CDC for each simultaneously existing record in the memory" appearing in previous claim 6 has been amended to read "a respective CDC associated with the record". This limitation is clearly supported by the original specification. See, for example paragraphs 31-32. Thus:

"A first application of the method involves assigning memory to the applet, and initializing a set of stored change detection codes (SCDCs),

each of which is associated with a respective record in a file stored in the memory 16 of the electronic token 10.” [para. 31]

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

At paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner argues that Algren “clearly discloses calculating a change detection code for each record in the memory and comparing the calculated CDC with a stored CDC in the manner similar to the claimed language”. With respect, the teaching of Algren, referring to either the reference as a whole or referring to the passages identified by the examiner, fails to support the Examiner’s characterization.

In particular, Algren explicitly teaches that a single change detection code is calculated across the entire database. More particularly, Algren teaches:

“... a checksum is calculated on a database stored in a SIM card...” [col. 2, lines 59-60]

“If the stored checksum does not match the calculated checksum, then a change has occurred in the contents of the database...” [col 2. lines 64-66]

“a checksum is calculated using the values of the records of the database...” [col 4, lines 11-12]

“the checksum (e.g. 2 bytes/phonebook) will ... change whenever the database is modified.” [col 4, lines 17-20]

Note that nowhere does Algren teach or suggest that multiple checksums are calculated, or that a respective checksum is calculated for each record of the database. Furthermore, it will be plainly obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that a checksum of “2 bytes/phonebook” implies a single checksum covering the entire database, and cannot possibly contain sufficient information to provide a respective change detection code associated with each record, as required by the present invention.

As such, Algren plainly fails to teach or fairly suggest the claim limitations to calculating a respective CDC associated with each record. Furthermore, Algren does not provide any motivation for making the required modification.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the presently claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teaching of Ahlgren et al. None of the known prior art provides the missing teaching. In particular, none of the known prior art references teach or fairly suggest the calculation of a respective CDC for each record, and the use of that respective CDC to send information of changes to a registering element via SMS messaging. Nor to any of the cited reference teach or fairly suggest the advantages obtained thereby.

Accordingly, it is believed that the present invention is in condition for allowance, and early action in that respect is courteously solicited.

If any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this response, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-5113.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent Daniels/

By: Kent Daniels, P.Eng.
Reg. No. 44,206
Attorney for the Applicants

Date: April 18, 2007

Ogilvy Renault LLP
Suite 1500
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, Quebec
Canada, H3A 2Y3